Exhibit N Voris Deposition Excerpts

In the Matter of:

Very Reverend Georges F. de Laire, J.C.L. vs Gary Michael Voris, et al.

> Gary Michael Voris February 08, 2023

68 Commercial Wharf • Boston, MA 02110 888.825.3376 - 617.399.0130 Global Coverage Magnals.com



Gary Michael Voris February 08, 2023

```
1
               UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
             FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
 2
             CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:21-cv-00131-JL
 3
     ----X
 4
   VERY REVEREND GEORGES F. de
 5
   LAIRE, J.C.L.,
                  Plaintiff,
6
 7
      ٧.
8
   GARY MICHAEL VORIS, ANITA CAREY,
   ST. MICHAEL'S MEDIA a/k/a CHURCH
9
   MILITANT,
10
                  Defendants.
11
   -----X
12
13
    VIDEOTAPED 30(B)(6) DEPOSITION OF ST. MICHAEL'S MEDIA
14
       A/K/A CHURCH MILITANT BY GARY MICHAEL VORIS,
15
16
       AND GARY MICHAEL VORIS, INDIVIDUALLY, DAY 2
                    Conducted Remotely
17
18
                     2900 Hilton Road
19
                    Ferndale, Michigan
20
                      February 8, 2023
21
                  10:06 a.m. to 6:09 p.m.
22
23
24
   Reporter: Laurie J. Berg, CCR, RPR, CRR, CLR, CER
```

Gary Michael Voris February 08, 2023

		278
1	APPEARANCES	
2		
3	Suzanne M. Elovecky, Esquire PARTRIDGE SNOW & HAHN, LLP	
4	30 Federal Street Boston, Massachusetts 02110	
5	617.292.7900 selovecky@psh.com	
6	(Present via videoconference.)	
7	COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF	
8	Kathleen H. Klaus, Esquire MADDIN, HAUSER, ROTH & HELLER, P.C.	
9	28400 Northwestern Highway 2nd Floor	
10	Southfield, Michigan 48034-1839 248.354.4030	
11	kklaus@maddinhauser.com (Present via videoconference.)	
12	-and-	
13	Neil B. Nicholson, Esquire	
14	NICHOLSON LAW FIRM, PLLC 58 North State Street	
15	Post Office Box 41371 48034 Concord, New Hampshire 03302-4137	
16	603.932.7872 neil@nicholson-lawfirm.com	
17	(Present via videoconference.)	
18	COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANTS	
19	Also Present:	
20	Father Georges F. de Laire (Present via videoconference.)	
21	Christine Niles, Esquire	
22	(Present via videoconference.)	
23	Luc-Bernard Val, Legal Video Specialist (Present via videoconference.)	
24		

Gary Michael Voris February 08, 2023

don't know if it's a video script or an article script, I can't remember.

MS. ELOVECKY: Okay. For the record, there -- there wasn't an article that was similar to this that was produced along with the other articles that were produced, purportedly having been either authored by or contributed to by Balestrieri, and I also searched the Church Militant website and wasn't finding this. It's -- it's not -- not really that relevant. Just for the purpose of the record, I haven't seen that it was published.

BY MS. ELOVECKY:

Q. But I'd like to just turn our attention to the e-mail. So if you look at the bottom of CM1284, which is on your screen now, Christine Niles states, "I will publish this under your pseudonym Tom Jones. Michael, do you want this up today?"

Did I read that correctly?

- A. (Deponent viewing exhibit.) Yes, you did.
- Q. And when you go up about to -- like one-third down the page, Ms. Niles corrects herself and says, "Sorry, I meant Tom Moore."

Do you see that?

A. (Deponent viewing exhibit.) Yes, I do.

Gary Michael Voris February 08, 2023

- Q. Okay. And so, do you know if Mr. Balestrieri ever did publish anything on the Church Militant website under the name Tom Moore?
- A. I don't remember, but the Tom Moore name was a name he and I came up with very early on just to be able to refer to him, not in a publication fashion, but just to sorta keep his identity secret from, you know, people who would be interested in finding out where we were getting information from.

So there was a time -- I don't remember when we stopped doing it, but there was a time, for a very long time, where he was actually in my phone as Tom Moore.

Q. Okay. Now, if you go -- so I -- we just pointed out that e-mail a third of the page down from Ms. Niles, but I want to go the one below that, which was Monday, April 23rd, 2018, at 11:35 a.m.

Do you see that?

- A. (Deponent viewing exhibit.) Yes, I do.
- Q. Okay. All right. So I guess there, she's saying, "Isn't that the name you approved of with Mike Sherry?"

Did I read that correctly?

A. (Deponent viewing exhibit.) Yes, that's

Gary Michael Voris February 08, 2023

460

1 | correct.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Who is Mike Sherry?
- A. He's our IT guy.
- Q. Okay. And so, are you aware of Mr. Balestrieri ever publishing on the Church Militant website under the name Tom Jones, which was the m -- the misstated one, right?
 - A. I -- yeah, I don't believe so.
- Q. Okay. And then when you look at the top of the pa -- the top e-mail on the page, Mr. Balestrieri states, "After reflection, let's use the pseudonym and pen name of a purported priest to try and throw off the scent, like 'Rev. Michael X.'"

Did I read that correctly?

- A. (Deponent viewing exhibit.) That's correct.
- Q. Okay. And he did, in fact, publish under that name; isn't that right?
- A. I believe so. I -- if you tell me so, yes, because I'm pretty sure I have a memory of that, but I don't -- I couldn't -- I'm under oath, I don't want to say that I know for certain, but I'm pretty sure that's correct.
- Q. We will scroll through the articles that were produced and you'll see that that was the case, but

Gary Michael Voris February 08, 2023

```
461
 1
   we'll --
 2
             Okay.
         Α.
             -- look at it on the record. So --
 3
         0.
 4
             I shall take your word.
         Α.
             Well, you won't have to. I'll show you, so.
 5
         0.
             (Laughter.)
 6
 7
             BY MS. ELOVECKY:
             And then he also states, "That way a lot of
 8
         Q.
 9
    suspicion would be directed to all canonists in the
   U.S. called Michael --
10
             (Deponent viewing exhibit.) Mm-hmm.
11
         Α.
             -- plus it's a great patronal name, right"
12
         Q.
   question mark.
13
14
             Did I read that correctly?
             (Deponent viewing exhibit.) Yes, you did.
15
         Α.
             Okay. So do you have any understand -- well,
16
17
   when you received this e-mail, did you have any
   understanding of what he meant by to tro -- "try to
18
    throw off the scent"?
19
             well, sure, because the information that he
20
    is providing in this script is very sensitive
21
22
    information that bishops and chanceries keep very
    close to their vest for the obvious reason. And
23
    again, you have to kind of step outside of the e-mail
24
```

Gary Michael Voris February 08, 2023

particular for a moment and look at the context.

The context is that the sacrament of marriage in the church and the Catholic teaching in the church is, if you are validly -- I'm sorry -- if you are married in the church, the presumption is it is a valid marriage and you are married until one of you dies.

The annulment process is engaged in by a couple who come to believe, rightly or wrongly, that they were never validly married. So -- and if they weren't validly married, then they're not married in the church. They might be civilly married, and that's disposed of with a divorce, but in the sacramental realm, they would be -- the marriage would have to be annulled.

So you approach the church, normally, your home diocese, and you say, I'm -- we or I am appealing my case or filing my case to have our marriage declared null and void, as in it never happened to begin with. Despite the fact that you may have, you know, a nice church wedding, a nice reception and honeymoon and you've had kids and the whole bit, something comes up, down the road, a piece of information arises in the course of the couple

Gary Michael Voris February 08, 2023

believing they are married, which raises the question in, at least one of their minds, hey, are we actually validly married?

So, for example, if -- if one party, husband or wife, knew at the time of the wedding, the marriage, that they never intended to have children and they withheld that information from their spouse, that's grounds for an annulment, because in Catholic teaching, for a marriage to be valid, there's a number of conditions, but one of them has to be, is -- that you have to be open to the -- you know, to having children.

Now, obviously, some marriages don't -- whatever, there's health issues, that doesn't make the marriage invalid and null. It just means that the health reasons prevented it. But if you could get pregnant, you would have the baby or babies.

But if you walk into it with the intention of defying the church's teaching and you just keep that to yourself and you don't reveal it to either your husband or your wife and it comes out later on, that marriage is invalid.

So the injured party, who did want children, does want children, would go appeal to the church, to

Gary Michael Voris February 08, 2023

the diocese and say, hey, here's my situation; she lied or he lied, whatever it is. And so, you know, I wanted children and they never did and they lied to me about it, so the church would grant the -- would grant the annulment, meaning the marriage never occurred, sacramentally, to begin with, so both parties are now free to go marry.

Those -- but there are also many abuses in the realm of people filing for annulments and many people in the church, including, for example, Cardinal Burke, who has given many talks on this topic around the country and at the Canon Law Society of America dinners and conferences, are -- many people are on the record as saying that the staffs in individual chanceries, when it comes to annulment cases, are ridiculously understaffed and very poorly educated, and they're handing out annulments like candy, meaning they shouldn't be doing them, but they're just -- they're overwhelmed and overworked and they have no idea what they're doing. They're completely incompetent.

So that's what we're -- that's what the point of this discussion he and I had was, and that's what this first article or script was pointing to. So you

Gary Michael Voris February 08, 2023

might imagine, you know, living proof of the incompetence charge that half the dioceses are giving out an annulment to every single case that comes before them and then, of the remaining half, it's through the roof with them as well. That's quite a black eye on the part of the church.

And the only people who would know this information are the canonists themselves, like, in this case, Marc, and other canonists that we have discussed this with who -- besides Marc, who also agree with that take, that the -- they're -- they're loaded with incom -- I mean, Cardinal Burke has standed up -- stood up and given speeches about this. He's talked in the general, when he talks about that, but Marc and other canonists have given us the names of horrible -- many canonists, as a matter of fact, have given us the names of people working in the annulment area of various dioceses, multiple dioceses, and all of it lines up.

And the only way to prove that it lines up is to have these actual numbers, which the church doesn't want people seeing, because it makes the case that you're incompetent, you're screwing around with the sacraments, which is the life blood of the church,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

20

21

22

23

24

Gary Michael Voris February 08, 2023

466

you're -- you bishops are not doing the job you should be doing.

So, you know, you're not keeping guard over people's souls and the -- and the authenticity of the sacraments and, you know, you're causing families to, you know, break up and, you know -- you know, fatherless kids and one thing after another and all the ills that fall from this sort of thing, well, it becomes pretty clear pretty fast why nobody who's relaying this information to us would want to have their name attached to it.

- Q. And it's your testimony that you received this information from Mr. Balestrieri but also other -- also other canonists --
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. -- is that correct?
 - A. That's correct, yes.
- Q. Okay. And what is the purpose, if you leave that.

What was your understanding in April of 2018 as to why publishing under a pseudonym was favorable to just publishing anonymously, such as with the Church Militant byline?

A. Because it proves that -- it -- it attaches a

Gary Michael Voris February 08, 2023

467

- -- an office to the material -- as in Reverend, attaches an -- an office to the material, which gives us a greater weight that it's actually authentic.
- Q. And what is the office that the word "Reverend" implies?
 - A. Priest.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. But that's not true, is it?
- A. What -- what's not true, Reverend?
- Q. That Marc Balestrieri is a priest?
- A. No, it's also true his name isn't Tom Moore or Michael X.
- Q. So the purpose was to attach an office to the author of this article which was not genuine, correct?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. The -- our -- our concern wasn't the -- our concern was that, is the information accurate and is it authentic, as in it can be authenticated by somebody who knows and that is what we were going to do here, I don't know that we actually did it as you said, if this never actually made it to print. But anyway, yes, that would've been the -- that would've been my thinking, certainly, behind it.
 - Q. And there was no concern that the readership

Gary Michael Voris February 08, 2023

was being misled to thinking that an article was being written by a priest when it was not --

A. No.

- O. -- is that accurate?
- A. No. No. Yeah, that -- that is accurate.

 No, there wouldn't be -- again, it's the information.

 It's the story that matters.

I mean, you know, from a -- from a journalistic standpoint, I mean, think of the Pentagon papers or, you know, Deep Throat with Watergate or any of those things. The point is, even the -- even the fact-checkers at the New York Times had to make crap up when it came to the Russia, Russia, Russia stuff and to convince their public that the information was accurate, they attributed it to inside sources, when the whole thing was a pack of lies.

But nonetheless, in this case, we happen to know it wasn't lies, because not only was Marc, who was a person who had deep knowledge of this stuff, but also other canonists who were able to verify all of this information for us. So it's not a question of being deceptive about the author, it's a question about being accurate about the information from an authoritative source.

Gary Michael Voris February 08, 2023

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

MIDDLESEX, SS.

I, Laurie J. Berg, Certified Court Reporter, Registered Professional Reporter, Certified Realtime Reporter, Certified LiveNote Reporter, Certified eDepoze Reporter and Notary Public, in and for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, do hereby certify that pursuant to appropriate notice of taking deposition, there remotely appeared before me the following named person, to wit: GARY MICHAEL VORIS, who was by me duly sworn; that he was thereupon examined upon his oath and his examination reduced to writing by me; and that the deposition is a true record of the testimony given by the witness.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 20th day of February, 2023.

My commission expires:

September 14, 2023

Notary Public